

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office action mailed June 11, 2007. Currently, claims 1-32 are pending. Applicants have amended claims 1-3, 7, 11, 13-18, 22, 25-26, 29, and 31, and cancelled claims 6, 9-10, 21, 28 and 32. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-32.

I. Summary of the Examiner's Objections

The Abstract was objected to because of containing informalities.

Claims 9-11 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Claims 1-3, 7, 13-18, 21, 25-26, 28 and 31 were objected to because of containing informalities.

Claims 25-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-5, 9-14, 17-20, 24-27, and 31-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,999,344 ("Hosono" herein).

II. Summary of the Amendments

Claims 1-3, 7, 11, 13-18, 22, 25-26, 29, and 31 are amended. Claims 6, 9, 10, 21, 28 and 32 are cancelled.

III. Remarks

The ABSTRACT has been corrected per the objection of the Examiner.

The Examiner's objections to claims 11 – 3, 7, 13 – 18, 21, 25 – 26, 28 and 31 have been addressed by amendment or rendered moot by cancellation of the respective claim. The Examiner's attention to detail in the rejection is greatly appreciated.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 25 – 32 now particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. The controller has been defined as "coupled to" the memory array.

It is respectfully submitted all pending claims are now allowable over *Hosono*. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 6 which was not subject to an objection or rejection.

It is therefore submitted that claim 1 and claims 2 – 5, 7, 8, 11 – 16 dependent therefrom are now allowable.

Claim 17 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 21. Claim 21 was dependent on claim 18, but the limitations of claim 18 have not been amended into claim 17. However, claim 21 includes a limitation similar to that of claim 6 and claim 21 was not subject to a substantive rejection over prior art. It is therefore submitted the claim 17 is allowable, and claims 18 – 20, 22 – 24 dependent therefrom are likewise allowable.

Claim 25 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 28. Claim 28 was not subject to a rejection based on *Hosono* and the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. Section 112 has been addressed. It is therefore submitted claim 25 and claims 26, 27, 29 – 31 dependent therefrom are now allowable.

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 11, 2007

By: /Larry E. Vierra/
Larry E. Vierra
Reg. No. 33,809

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DE NIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, California 94105
Telephone: 415.369.9660
Facsimile: 415.369.9665